

### **Remarks**

Receipt is acknowledged of the Office Action of February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2003. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. The above amendments to the claims and specification are identical in substance to those previously submitted on June 23, 2003. No new matter was added then or now.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings (although the formal drawings were not yet received by the Chief Draftsman as of the date of the Office Action) because of the drawings original failure to show the shutter and window as claimed in Claim 22, an on-off pushbutton mechanism as claimed in Claim 35, and the other embodiment relating to the analog watch-like face with radial grooves. The Applicant has canceled, without prejudice, Claims 22 and 35-40 based on the aforementioned objections and yet, reserves the right to later file a continuation application for the canceled claims and subject matter.

The Examiner pointed out the inconsistency between the original written description of the drawings and, specifically, reference numerals 320 and 330 in comparison to the Drawings. Accordingly, reference numerals 320 and 330 have been switched on pages 16 and 17 of the specification so that they are now consistent with the drawings. These changes introduce no new subject matter and are meant to overcome the Examiner's objection. A minor typo in the specification was noted and also corrected.

More specifically, Figure 11 shows the primary links and the connecting links of one embodiment of the invention. The original description mislabeled both the primary links and the connecting links as "320" and "330," respectively. The application has now been amended such that Figure 11 remains the same, but the text on pages 16 and 17 now has the primary links

correctly labeled as “330” and the connecting links correctly labeled as “320.”

Applicant has accepted the Examiner’s renumbering of originally numbered claims 23 (second occurrence) through 39, as claims 24 through 40. The language of the claims, including the originally indicated dependences have been preserved, except to the extent amended herein.

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to define the “means” set forth therein and to implicate § 112, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph. Many of the claims have been amended to clarify language, to accomplish the Examiner’s suggestions and to eliminate the Examiner’s objections. No new matter has been introduced.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the elements/limitations of claims 2 and 3. The prior art does not teach a set of primary and connecting links which form a bracelet with the primary links having an hour of the day indicating means for indicating each of the sequential hours of the day, with either the primary and/or the connecting links having a visual reminder means for reminding the wearer of an event by use of a selectively viewable mechanism which is associated with each of the primary and/or the connecting links to indicate to the wearer an hour of the day corresponding to an event to be remembered. This claim and its dependent claims define allowable subject matter and are allowable.

The Schickedanz reference, US Patent No. 4,130,987 is a timepiece and comprises a bracelet-like watch where a set of primary links are provided for the hours of the day. However, there is no set of connecting links interposed between the primary links (as claimed) in the present invention in claim 1, and in any case, the watch functions such that a single primary link is illuminated and certainly not two or more of the primary links, at the same time. Otherwise the watch of the reference would not indicate to the wearer the precise time of day. There is no

teaching in the '987 reference of the claimed invention comprising a bracelet of primary and connecting links therebetween with a time of day indicating means for the primary links and a visual reminder means for each of the primary and/or connecting links for reminding the wearer of an event(s) which visual reminder means comprises a selectively viewable mechanism associated with each of the primary links for the hours of the day for an event(s) to be remembered.

Reconsideration of claim 1 is requested in view of the amended language and the limited teaching of the cited reference.

Claim 11 was already indicated by the Examiner to define patentable subject matter. It has been amended to clarify its language. Claim 11 and its dependent claims are now allowable.


Claim 23, too, was indicated by the Examiner to define patentable subject matter. It, too, has been amended to clarify its language and avoid possible indefiniteness objections. Claim 23 and its dependent claims are believed fully allowable.

In the absence of an uncovering by the Examiner of more pertinent prior art, this application is believed to be in a condition of allowance. Prompt and favorable action is earnestly solicited and believed to be fully warranted.

Dated: July 29, 2003

LEVISOHN, LERNER, BERGER & LANGSAM, LLP  
757 Third Avenue  
Suite 2500  
New York, New York 10017  
(212) 486-7272  
[alangsam@LLBL.com](mailto:alangsam@LLBL.com)

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrew S. Langsam  
Reg. No. 28,556  
Attorney for Applicant